PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Bettina Sand Dørffer[1]

Incorporating the Rights of Non-Human Life into our Daily Lives: Ecological Citizenship through a 'Deep Ecology' Perspective[2]

This paper will introduce a philosophical gap within the international political laws and plans by showing that an ecological citizenship is already being performed and happening nationally around the world e.g., Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand. For the citizenship to become fully transnational a global account containing its duties and obligations must be provided. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals are currently the only version of a transnational plan we've got thus the Goal 15: 'Life on Land' will be assessed through the deep ecological principles because deep ecology will be used in this paper as the morally right way to understand an ecological citizenship. An assessment of the Goal will conclude that morally we are failing as the United Nations 17 Goals are far from the morals of deep ecology, but the goals are still one step closer toward an ecological citizenship than what we had before. This paper will show possible ways to practically implement the principles of deep ecology through some current deep ecological practices like the lifestyles of Indigenous' Peoples, the religion of Jainism, veganism, a new way of calculating GNP, the concept of interspecies solidarity and wild gardens. Finally, it will be concluded that an ecological citizenship through a deep ecological perspective can be used to incorporate the rights of non-human life into our daily lives, for example, by using a radically revised version of the United Nations 17 Goals.

INTRODUCTION

In 1976 the European Commission agreed on the first directive for the protection of the welfare of farm animals. This directive became amended in 1998 where five rules of freedom was added to it, thereby making the EU a leading institution "in recognizing the animal welfare consequences of industrial animal farming" (Mcleod-Kilmurray, 2012, p. 76). In 2009, the EU presented an amended treaty which was the first to recognize animals as sentient beings (European Commission, 2020) but a whole year before that, Ecuador took in 2008 a step further and was the first country in the world to give nature rights. The mountains, rivers, and forests were granted "legally enforceable rights to 'exist, flourish and evolve.'" (Charman, 2008, p. 131). These rights became known as the Rights of Nature, a new constitution that is politically enforced in Ecuador. The new

[1] Department of Humanities and Law, Faculty of Media and Communication, Bournemouth University, Poole, England. Email: BettinaDoerffer@hotmail.com.
[2] The author wishes to dedicate this paper to Dr Savvas Voutyras, without whom this paper would had never been written.

constitution protects nature from corporations and businesses as it recognizes the fundamental right of the ecosystems to exist. In 2010, Bolivia followed the Ecuadorian example and created a national 'rights of nature' law. In the following years more countries have followed this example and courts in Columbia, India and the parliament of New Zealand have recognized that rivers and other ecosystems have legal rights (Margil, 2018). Despite the creation of these national laws, current global policies addressing biodiversity are still fragmented and target specific (Brunell, 2013) and they rarely take the value of biodiversity, itself, into account. Thus, there is a need, a practical problem, for "mainstreaming biodiversity into development policies, plans and programmes" (UNESCO, 2018, p. 41). Also needed in the future are policies which take into account the equal consideration of nature and animals on the same level as "science, sociology, economic paradigms and cultural norms" (UNESCO, 2018, p. 21), which means that all affected parties must be involved, included, and considered equally. But at this point, we do not have such plans, laws, or policies on a transnational scale.

Reading through these examples of national laws and policies it becomes clear that there is a gap within the global policies as being the lack of an international and transnational plan for the thriving and maintaining of biodiversity that also keeps the biodiversity at the centre of that plan. Ecological citizenship as a terminology isn't specifically mentioned or even used in our everyday conversations but, with the above-mentioned examples, we do see signs of ecological citizenship already being practiced. The citizenship has, therefore, to some extend already become a reality, nationally, but an ecological citizenship is a transnational citizenship which means it needs global, transnational institutions for it to be exercised and fully implemented through. So, how can an ecological citizenship be further implemented in our world? On what moral and ethical grounds? Through which transnational plan? The United Nations (UN) 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is the only version of a global and transnational plan that we currently have in the world consisting of clear objectives and duties. However, ecological citizenship and the UN SDGs are all about sustainability which is human-centric. This means that they both operate by adjusting current practices so that these practices can continue sustainably for future human generations. Humans can therefore (just by adjusting their current practices) continue with the status quo without any substantial or radical changes to their lives. In contrast, the philosophy of Deep Ecology is about re-thinking the way we think about nature and the non-human life that co-exists on this planet with us. All living things must, according to deep ecology, be re-thought into the equation of the future of Earth, not for the sake of human sustainability but for the sake of all of nature, itself, and its habitants. If deep ecology became our moral compass, how would that potentially change the world? And how would it work in practice?

This paper will provide an understanding of what an ecological citizenship is by introducing its duties and objectives, arguing that the philosophy of deep ecology should be the morally right way to understand the ecological citizenship. After a discussion of the contributions and challenges of deep ecology I will suggest that the philosophy is taken as an Ideal Theory in order for deep ecology to become more applicable in practice. Since deep ecology is an overdemanding philosophy that requires massive and extensive changes to our whole political, social and economic systems, Ideal Theory will help us to address these demands. Through Ideal Theory we can assess how near or far we are from deep ecology. The UN SDG 15: 'Life on Land' will then be assessed through the deep ecological principles as this particular goal has the most implications and consequences for animals, nature and biodiversity, out of all the 17 goals. This paper will later argue that morally we are failing as the UN 17 SDGs are far from the morals of deep

ecology, but by taking the philosophy as an Ideal Theory we have the guidelines to get us closer to an ecological citizenship. Finally, I will highlight certain examples of current deep ecological practices from around the world to give examples of possible ways to practically implement the principles of deep ecology. These examples are as follows; the lifestyles of Indigenous' Peoples, the religion of Jainism, veganism, a new way of calculating GNP, the concept of interspecies solidarity, and wild gardens.

LITERATURE REVIEW

What is Ecological Citizenship?

A global citizenship recognizes the complex web of connections and interdependencies where our actions and choices impact people and communication nationally and internationally, building on the belief that humankind is essentially one (Heywood, 2013). The ecological citizenship indicates that an ecological component, such as eco-centric values, is added to the understanding of connections and interdependencies. Because of the addition of eco-centric values, an ecological citizenship calls for a philosophical turn in human perception of reality in order to prevent further devastation to our planet (Dedeoglu and Dedeoglu, 2020). It also demands and relies on a change of consciousness. So, turning from an anthropocentric world view to a more ecological world view, is this transnational citizenship's way of creating a more harmonious and equal living for all, human and non-human alike. Ecological citizenship deals with non-contractual responsibilities whose virtues of care and compassion mean that the ecological citizens exercise sustainable behaviour simply because they are the right thing to do (Dobson, 2003). The citizenship is explicitly non-territorial and requires collective and individual actions and its community has a social connection where members acknowledge each other in ways that affect their behavior and raises an awareness of other members. The basis of the citizenship is a contract where there are no rights without responsibilities and these responsibilities are practiced through our obligations. The ecological citizenship's obligations are owed to strangers because 'just as environmental problems cross political boundaries, so do the obligations of ecological citizenship' (Dobson, 2003, p. 120). The citizenship is further defined as being inclusive and understanding its own effects on other people as well as the environment. A community which respects others' perspectives, experiences, and relationships (Dobson, 2003) means that wild animals and other non-human life-forms who either live free of human contact or maintain their own independent existence can be included into the citizenship by being respected as their own sovereign community (Spannring, 2019). It's a citizenship which stresses responsibility for the common good as well as an ethic of care for all humans, non-humans and nature, but it's also important to mention how the ecological citizenship only gives instrumental value to nature which is defined by Brennan and Norva (2002) as nature simply being recognized as a means to an end.

Justice is the primary virtue of ecological citizenship with care and compassion being the secondary virtues (Dobson, 2003). Humanitarian obligation within ecological citizenship is thus an obligation exercised through justice which makes it more politically binding than for example charity work. However, individually, people tend to be reluctant in changing their consumption habits unless politically, economically or socially forced to and usually also resentful when forced (Goodwin, 1997). For this reason, political regulations, laws and forced compulsory work from states upon citizens is recognized by some scholars as negative implementation behaviors because they will

only lead to a weak structure that lacks the strong foundation of a participatory democracy and public support. However, laws and regulations are also key dynamics in the startup of changing human behaviour, but these must be backed by individual commitment and participation before they can be truly effective. Everyone, may that be citizen, business, or state, must be committed to the change (Asilsoy and Oktay, 2018). The 'challenge' with modern people is how they tend to believe that other people should use their "social, economic and technological powers" (Howles et al, 2018, p. 1000) to solve the world's problems, thus allowing "a continuation (or even an amplification) of the trajectory of 'progress' that has been the root-cause of the crisis in the first place" (Howles et al, 2018, p. 1000) and reducing the action of all others to be redundant. The idea of ecological citizenship, however, believes that "we are all connected, and what humans do is both shaped by and itself shapes what happens to that greater whole" (Howles et al, 2018, p. 1003).

To sum up: as a citizenship, ecological citizenship, recognizes the complex web of connections and interdependencies where our actions and choices impact people nationally and internationally. It's based on the virtues of justice, care and compassion and it exercises sustainable behaviour. It's non-territorial beyond space and time, requires collective and individual actions and focusses on duties. The contract of ecological citizenship is where there are no rights without responsibilities and these responsibilities are practiced through our obligations owed to strangers. It respects other people's perspectives, experiences, and relationships. It's inclusive and calls for a change in consciousness. It's a citizenship which stresses responsibility for the common good as well as an ethic of care for all humans, non-humans and nature. However, ecological citizenship is limited as it only gives instrumental value to nature, so, a global understanding and recognition of intrinsic value as well as the rights of non-humans is needed before this concept of citizenship can be fully inclusive and ecological. That is why I have chosen deep ecology to function as the moral understanding of ecological citizenship which will be explored in the following section.

The Contributions and Challenges of Deep Ecology

"It is often said to be morally wrong for human beings to pollute and destroy parts of the natural environment and to consume a huge proportion of the planet's natural resources. If that is wrong, is it simply because a sustainable environment is essential to (present and future) human well-being? Or is such behaviour also wrong because the natural environment and/or its various contents have certain values in their own right so that these values ought to be respected and protected in any case?" (Brennan and Norva, 2002).

Arne Næss, a Norwegian Philosopher, was the first to come up with the term Deep Ecology (Brennan and Norva, 2002; Madsen, 2016), and it is both considered a philosophy ("a field study, an approach to knowledge" (Anker and Witoszek, 1998, p. 248)) as well as an ecosophy ("one's own personal code of values and a view of the world which guides one's own decisions." (Anker and Witoszek, 1998, p. 248)). The essence of deep ecology is that it gives intrinsic value to nature and Brennan and Norva (2002) defines the difference between instrumental value (Ecological Citizenship) as "the value of things as means to further some other ends" and intrinsic value (Deep Ecology) as "the value of things as ends in themselves regardless of whether they are also useful as means to other ends." Deep Ecology is defined by Næss himself (1989) as a guideline, a direction, an eco-centric philosophy, which is about thinking of nature first before human needs. It believes in the equal right to live and blossom for all living things (Næss, 1973) and is built on the ideas of intrinsic value, a right to flourish for all things, an

ideological change in political, economic, and technological structures, and an obligation of action (Sessions and Næss, 1984). In deep ecology, humans are considered to be inseparable from nature so harming nature in any way means harming ourselves (Næss, 1989). The latter comes from Næss' relational theory which is that nothing in nature exists apart and nothing exists only for themselves. No tree gives water, sugar, and shade to only itself, the bees spread the pollen of flowers in return for nectar, and the river gives life to more than just itself (Wohlleben, 2017). Everything in nature exists based on serving others, that is the fundamental principle of ecosystems which Homo Sapiens Sapiens came from and is still a part of despite what we might like to think (Harari, 2011). Deep ecology is "a re-examination of how we perceive and construct our world." (Næss, 1989, p. 19) and it offers a change of consciousness, "a transition to a more egalitarian attitude to life and the unfolding life on Earth" (Næss, 1989, p. 91). Næss believed that the environmental movement needed to do more than just to protect and/or preserve the environment. He believed "that a radical re-evaluation of the understanding of human nature was needed" (Madsen, 2016) and that the change had to begin at once (Næss, 1989). Næss came up with the principles of deep ecology after being inspired by the Sherpas (Brennan and Norva, 2002), a mountain-dwelling people living in Nepal who are of Tibetan culture and descent. The Sherpas practice a religion which is a mixture of Buddhism and animism (Britannica, 2019) and within the teachings of Buddha, the killing of insects and other creatures should be avoided as it has bad karmic consequences (Cherry and Sandhu, 2013). The Sherpas respect the mountains they live in and try to prevent tourists and foreign rock and mountain climbers from doing polluting activities while they visit, such as killing animals and burn rubbish because such activities will anger the Gods (Britannica, 2019). Næss (1989) calls these principles of deep ecology "an opening to a full scale critique of our civilisation" (Næss, 1989, p. 4) but mostly they are meant to be points on which people can agree on. Næss (1989) advocates for humanity to consider the needs of ecosystems and other species on the same level as we consider our own and uses the idea of a friendship to emphasise his meaning: "entities in nature are things to be respected for their own sakes, simply because they are there and near to us. Like friends – we should never use them only as a means to something else" (Næss, 1989, p. 11). Næss here speaks about how treating a friend superficially and/or with disrespect causes a person to lose that friend somewhat quickly. And the same could be true about nature.

Self-realisation is a concept within deep ecology which refers to a greater Self (the ecological self), a Self which is about including other people, species, and nature itself making the world around you become an extended part of you. The idea of Self-realisation can be understood like entering in a romantic relationship: "in love one loses part of one's identity by gaining a greater identity" (Næss, 1989, p. 11). For Self-realisation to include nature and other species it does not mean that humans become subordinated but rather integrated into nature, living in harmony with it (Madsen, 2016). Nature thus becomes an extension of humanity (Næss, 1989) and once the ecological self has been realized within ourselves, we will practice a biocentric egalitarianism lifestyle (Madsen, 2016) without any conflict of interest because there will no longer be one (Næss, 1989). Biocentrism is an ethical perspective which believes that all life deserves equal moral consideration or has equal moral standing (DesJardin, 2015). Egalitarianism is a philosophy which builds on the idea of people being of equal worth and moral standing. People should either get the same, be treated the same, or be treated as equals (Arneson, 2002). So, by combining the ethical perspective (biocentrism) with the philosophy (egalitarianism) we will practise a lifestyle which believes that all life deserves equal moral consideration, and that all life (people, animal,

and plant-life) are of equal worth and should therefore be treated the same. Self-realisation is further described by Næss as "an active condition, not a place one can reach. No one ever reaches Self-realisation… just as no one in certain Buddhist traditions ever reaches nirvana…it is only a process, a way to live one's life" (Næss, 1989, p. 9). In short, Self-realisation is an ideal, a utopian vision.

Critique of Deep Ecology

Deep ecology has been criticized on many levels and from a neo-humanist perspective the intrinsic value as a concept is put into question in the fear that "assigning nature worth in itself somehow undermines moral concern for humanity" (Bratton, 1999, p. 5). There is, also, still concern for how deep ecology has a preference for nature (which is the point of the philosophy), a preference which is suspicious of technology and, according to neo-humanists, excludes human interests (Bratton, 1999). However, the exclusion of human interest is not the point of the philosophy; the point is to include others as Næss points out: "Ecological inspired attitudes…favor diversity of human ways of life, of cultures, of occupations, of economies…and they are opposed to the annihilation of seals and whales as much as that of human tribes and cultures." (Næss, 1979, p. 96)

Rights given to nature could potentially create a radical change in our societies and the way we think about animals and nature, yes, but is a radical change necessarily a bad thing? I would advocate that an inclusion of animals and nature into our daily lives and a tolerance and a respect for their lives would lead to the world society being more inclusive and tolerant toward other marginalized groups such as women, Indigenous Peoples, minority groups etc.

A feminist critique views Næss' Self-realization idea of an expanded self as a "disguised form of human colonialism" which is "unable to give nature its due as a genuine 'other' independent of human interest and purposes" (Brennan and Norva, 2002). To use Næss' own love relationship analogy (1989), the point of seeing yourself with someone, as part of someone else, becoming an 'us' instead of an 'I', mean that you believe that the extended part of yourself is equally worthy of your consideration as you consider yourself to be. Being in a love relationship means you become one without ever becoming each other. So, by expanding the idea of Self to nature only means that you and nature are now one, but you are still complete and equal individuals within the new constellation.

Finally, Guha (1989) calls deep ecology a compelling vision and states that "this new movement aims at nothing less than a philosophical and cultural revolution in human attitudes toward nature" (Guha, 1989, p. 71). Deep ecology and Næss are criticised for being vague and the implementation of the deep ecological movement (the practical action) into our modern society is called into question as how would a system built on ecocentrism function or even look like? (Anker and Witoszek, 1998). The philosophy would require a critical examination of the modern world, resulting in massive systemic changes worldwide which would involve both concrete decisions as well as abstract guidelines. Our democracy, for example, would suddenly function in regard, not just to human life but to animals, plants and landscapes (Næss, 1989). Deep ecology has also been criticized for being a utopian vision (Brennan and Norva, 2002) and for many people utopian visions usually means that nothing will ever happen, that the ideals changes nothing (Anker and Witoszek, 1998) and maybe there is something impossible about deep ecology, the Self-realization ideal and the principles. However, that doesn't mean we cannot strive towards it – it does not mean the philosophy should be ruled out as a solution, but we would need a way to make it applicable.

The Concept Behind Ideal Theory

John Rawls, an American political, ethical, and liberal philosopher, came up with a concept called Ideal Theory because he needed a theory to make his Theory of Justice applicable for everyday practices. The Theory of Justice was meant to provide a "just arrangement of the major political and social institutions" (Wenar, 2008) as well as a new social, economic, and technical structure, where its citizens ideally would possess two moral powers: a sense of justice and a conception of good (Wenar, 2008). The Theory of Justice was meant to serve as "a just framework for the legitimate use of political power" (Wenar, 2008) which means that a concept of Justice is used as the maximal standard to provide the Theory of Justice with the guideline that is morally best (Wenar, 2008). The concept of Justice works as the moral compass or guideline for political and social institutions within Rawls' Theory of Justice. The Theory of Justice is an egalitarian liberal philosophy which means that "citizens relate to each other as equals within a social order defined by reciprocity, instead of the unjust status hierarchies familiar from today" (Wenar, 2008). This means that the new structure of society (built on the Theory of Justice) would profoundly influence, affect, and change the individual lives of all citizens e.g., their personal and professional goals, their attitudes, their relationship with others, and their own characters (Wenar, 2008). John Rawls acknowledged that his Theory of Justice is utopian since it clearly accentuates the need for believing that "individuals are not inevitably selfish or amoral, and that international relations can be more than merely a contest for domination, wealth, and glory" (Wenar, 2008). Because of this Rawls came up with the idea of Ideal Theory which as defined by Mandle and Roberts-Cady (2021) is a theory which aims to identify the ideal principle, a principle that our current political and social institutions should be evaluated against. By introducing the concept of Ideal Theory Rawls could argue that his Theory of Justice should be used as an Ideal Theory stating that his "political philosophy provides a long-term goal of political endeavor, and in working toward it gives meaning to what we do today" (Wenar, 2008). One argument against using a political philosophy as an Ideal Theory, is that, as a society we do not need the principles of a utopian vision in order to realize what is wrong with our current society but the Ideal Theory is not meant to tell us what is wrong but what should be right. The chosen Ideal should act as a guide and, even though we cannot possibly know for sure the full effects by various policies created based on the chosen theory, it is important to keep in mind how it helps us to rebuild our society toward that Ideal. It's our measurement tool that is used for evaluating policies, societies, and institutions. It helps us to see how far we are from where we want to go – the further we are from deep ecology, the more problematic are our current policies. We must, however, acknowledge how shallow, narrow, and limited solutions may be all we can practically manage (to begin with anyway) but that doesn't mean we should stop trying to fulfil the utopian vision (Næss, 1989) which is a fixed end goal and the best version of our world as we can hope for (Wenar, 2008). It is therefore important to stress that this paper is not looking for an Ideal Theory but using deep ecology in this way will help us to reach an ecological citizenship through a deep ecological perspective. However, for Ideal Theory to work in practice it does require a general willingness from both citizens and society to comply with the chosen principles, but it's also important as well to have favourable social conditions and political cooperation wherein citizens and societies can abide by these principles (Wenar, 2008). The chosen principles in this paper are the deep ecological principles, which is built on

the ideas of: intrinsic value, right to flourish, ideological change in political, economic, and technological structures, and an obligation of action (Sessions and Næss, 1984). The global policies would, as they moved toward its Ideal Theory, ensure a minimum satisfaction of biological, environmental, and social needs for all living things (Næss, 1989).

To sum up: Deep Ecology is an ecocentric philosophy which consists of guiding principles (intrinsic value, right to flourish, ideological change in political, economic, and technological structures, and an obligation of action) that offer a biocentric egalitarian world view through its philosophy of an 'equal right to live for all living things'. It's about thinking of nature first and recognizing its intrinsic value which is a re-examination of how humans perceive nature and other species today. Deep ecology is generally a positive philosophy built on love and intrinsic value and if the world ends soon then the idea of sustainability advocated by ecological citizenship does not matter, but deep ecology is still morally valid. Deep ecology is an end where sustainability is a means, and that is why I argue that the philosophies of deep ecology should be functioning as the moral understanding of the ecological citizenship. Furthermore, if the philosophy is used as a regulatory Ideal Theory to adjust and radically change our practices and our society then even if we never reach a complete deep ecological world then every little step towards it will have made the world better for everyone, human, animal, and plant life. The use of deep ecology as an Ideal Theory means that we must keep doing better as people and as a global society. We have a model which we must work towards and by keep using deep ecology as our guide means that as a society, as people, we can accept that it takes a long time to get where we want to go because we know where we need to go. The Ideal Theory gives us an agreed and shared direction. In the next section the UN SDGs will be explained in general, but also why they were chosen for the case study. Then the UN SDG 15: 'Life on Land' will be assessed through the principles of deep ecology.

CASE STUDY

Why the UN 17 SDGs?

The United Nations put global practices and ethical obligations into a global action plan when the institution created the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, with the 17 Sustainable Development Goals at its core. This happened in 2015 and is a gigantic step in the right direction of forming an ecological citizenship for the world's population. The UN SDGs are built on a basis of strong principles such as: equality, dignity, and a respect for nature (Asah, 2015) as well as functioning as a framework of international accountability (Blaustein et al, 2018). This makes it a great case study subject for my advocacy on how to incorporate the rights of non-human life into our daily lives, using ecological citizenship as the movement, the practical action, and deep ecology as the basic idea, the inspiration, the Ideal Theory behind that movement.

METHODOLOGY

For the case study analysis, the UN SDG 15: 'Life on Land' will be assessed through the deep ecological principles. I have chosen this particular goal because it has the most implications and consequences for animals, nature and biodiversity out of all

the 17 goals. I will use a radical interpretation of deep ecology in order to make this assessment because a radical interpretation implies that while the deep ecologists would live out their respective ecosophies, they would also explicitly seek to change "the entire constitution through nonviolent action and constructing a new society based on a Deep Ecological system of justice" (Anker and Witoszek, 1998, p. 243). This means that "the existing anthropocentric system of justice" would be rejected "because it is based on a conspicuously inadequate understanding of ecology" (Anker and Witoszek, 1998, p. 243). The radical interpretation calls for a radical shift in consumption and production patterns which would require an alternate economic and political structure (Guha, 1989) as well as the change in consciousness which the deep ecology advocates.

In using the radical interpretation of deep ecology, I will critique the UN goals in my case study analysis by stating that the UN SDG's have failed from the very beginning, not because they aren't ambitious enough but because they were built and created on a wrong basis, philosophical foundation and ideal. Later I will give examples of deep ecological practices already performed around the world today to give an example of how the global society might look if we use deep ecology as our theoretical and ethical compass.

CASE STUDY ANALYSIS

The UN 17 Sustainable Development Goals is currently the only framework of international accountability (Blaustein et al, 2018) we have and the goals, which are based on human needs and human rights, can best be described as 'a survival kit for humanity' (UNESCO, 2018) meaning that the goals have been created for the sustainable future of humankind and only instrumental value has been given to animals, plants, and nature. Reading through the objectives of each 17 SDG, plant life and animals are barely mentioned, and if they are it is from a human need perspective (UN, 2020) and it can be interpreted as the end goal of preserving cultural and natural heritages is purely in the interest of humans alone. Goal 14 (Life below water) and Goal 15 (Life on land) are the only two goals within this mass design of interconnected and interdependent web of goals that put non-human life forefront of the equation. When one considers the massive impact that the natural world has on our daily life e.g., the very air we breathe, the water we drink, the food we eat, all our materials, one might wonder how only two goals out of 17 have been put aside to help protect, preserve and maintain nature and wildlife. Not just for human purposes and human needs but for the natural diversity itself. Although the SDGs are human-centered "biodiversity…underpins most SDGs and its loss constitutes a threat to both security and peace" (UNESCO, 2018, p. 10) which is why a deep ecological philosophy about intrinsic value and non-human rights makes sense to have at the very forefront of these goals and makes one question why it's not? Loss of biodiversity constitutes a threat to all life, not just that of humans, but unfortunately, today with our current mindset "there is a clear contradiction between government policies that favour environmental issues and those that favour industrial exploitation of natural resources, with the latter trumping the former" (ICCA Consortium, 2021). This means that this existing anthropocentric system of justice is based on an inadequate understanding of ecology (Anker and Witoszek, 1998) This further signifies that before the UN goals can be used as the contract of ecological citizenship, they must give the intrinsic value to nature that deep ecology can provide before an ecological citizenship can fully incorporate the rights of non-humans into our daily lives and societies.

Blaustein et al (2018) critiques the UN SDGs (especially 14 and 15 which are focused on the environment, animals, and biodiversity) for having a great focus on what is already illegal, e.g., wildlife trade, while neglecting to mention how many of the human activities which "threaten environmental sustainability and result in lasting ecological damage are perfectly legal" (Blaustein et al, 2018, p. 780) e.g., fracking, and industrial animal farming. This fact alone proves how the idea of sustainability was the wrong basis for creating a better life on Earth – for all living things, since sustainability, as mentioned before, is the green light for continuing with the status quo. This is also evident in the way that our current economic activities aren't mentioned as a problem when it is clear that "Humans' gross interference in nature mirrors our economic activity. Protection of what is left of free nature depends largely on the way humans are willing and able to change their ways of production and consumption – and the ideologies justifying the present economic misuse of the planet" (Næss, 1989, p. 129).

SDG 15 is created to "protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, stop and reverse land degradation, and halt the loss of biodiversity" (UN, 2020). This goal is a big one with nine targets which calls for many different actions but when it comes to the deep ecology thought, the goal is hugely inadequate. The goal calls for poaching and trafficking of (only) protected flora and fauna to end, and loss of biodiversity should be halted, while only extinction of threatened species (animals, not plant life) must be prevented, and those species protected. One target advocate how the enhancement of land capacity should be made "to provide benefits that are essential for sustainable development" (UN, 2020) prioritizing human use of the land capacity. While another target states how there must be a promotion of "fair and equitable sharing of the benefits" (UN, 2020) every reader can be certain that the fair and equitable sharing are meant for the human species alone.

A further examination of the goal shows that there is very superficial care and consideration given to animals and nature. Nowhere are any rights to life, rights of freedom, or any other right mentioned. Though the UN 17 SDGs are based on strong principles such as equality, dignity and a respect for nature, the goals still only provide nature with instrumental value while aiming for equality and dignity to humans alone, thereby, completely forgetting animals and plant life in the equation (Asah, 2015). The goals don't seem to highlight or even be aware of the interconnectedness of all things which could have shown the consequences of previous decisions and actions, thereby providing the potential agent (humans) with the motivation to act differently (Asah, 2015) instead of continuing with the status quo. The radical interpretation of deep ecology further calls for a radical shift in consumption and production patterns that requires an alternate economic and political structure (Guha, 1989) which the current UN SDGs cannot (in this current state) provide.

However, reading through the 17 goals in general, it is clear, that when it comes to ecological citizenship these goals are undoubtedly better than what we had before as a transnational community. The UN goals show the connections and interdependencies between our actions and choices as well as the impact these have locally, nationally, and internationally. The goals are in fact non-contractual responsibilities built on the values of justice, care, and compassion requiring both collective and individual action, and the obligations mentioned are owed to the global community. The UN goals hold a clear vision of what should be achieved, how they can be achieved and why, making them a good big step in the right direction but from the analysis above, they are clearly not anywhere near the account of duties deep ecology presents us with.

Looking at the UN 17 SDGs, it's evident that although nature has been considered, insofar as to help sustain basic human life, nature on its own and for its own benefits hasn't been. So, to change that, the following section will look at what the SDG 15 need to incorporate so that it meets the moral standards of deep ecology. SDG 15 (Life on land) requires equal consideration, care and justice, and an understanding of nature as a web of interwoven lives whose balance is a delicate ecosystem which through Self-realization is an expanded part of humans. Animal suffering in all forms need to be at the very forefront of this goal and all political practices and policies such as land degradation and all other practices causing unnecessary harm to plant life and ecosystems. The point of the following examples is not to rule out current thinking and behaviour but to give examples of possible practices will help bring the global world toward the agreed future based on the shared belief in the deep ecological principles.

Examples of Deep Ecological Practices

So how do we practice the deep ecological principles, even though, using it as an Ideal Theory, we are bound never to fulfil them? What could a radically revised version of the UN SDGs look like if using deep ecology as a moral guide? "How should we experience the world?... Are there examples of the expanded perspective? What would it look, feel, taste, smell, or sound like?" (Næss, 1989, p. 20). Indigenous people actively protect and preserve the ecosystems they live in, live with, and live off. They are depended on a healthy biodiversity which is "fundamental to their social, cultural and spiritual lives" (ICCA Consortium, 2021, p. 32). Their 'I have obligations' mentality stands in contrast to the Western liberal mantra of 'I have rights'. Indigenous people and their 'close to nature' societies have survived the anthropocentric industrialization and managed to maintain their own resource base for thousands of years which again is in stark contrast to most developed countries' who is the maker of many ecological disasters (Ehrlich and Turnbull, 2014). Ehrlich and Turnbull (2014) conclude their paper not by suggesting that we all start living like Aboriginals but by emphasising how much Western societies could learn from indigenous peoples' relationship with nature and their guiding principles of reciprocity, respect and responsibility to their environment which many indigenous people live by (ICCA Consortium, 2021).

Jainism is an Indian religion which considers nonviolence in any form, as the highest form of religious practice, whether that nonviolence is committed by body, mind, or speech. They avoid unnecessary travel and harmful activities of all kinds meaning that they cannot work certain jobs, such as butcher, industrial farmer, fishermen, animal experimenters etc. (Strohl et al, 2021). Jainism is called "the most insect-friendly religion" (Cherry and Sandhu, 2013, p. 202) as all water consumed should be boiled as to prevent the drinker from consuming other living life forms. Some Jain followers might abstain from eating after dark as one is more likely to unintentionally consume insects that have been attracted by the food. A Mukhavastrika is a piece of cloth one holds over the mouth so as to not inhale insects, a feather is used to sweep the ground before walking on it to prevent stepping on smaller life-forms, and they are strictly vegetarian (Strohl et al, 2021).

Veganism is a way of living but also a philosophy. It's a movement which transcends national borders, gender, sexuality, age, financial capabilities, religions, and education. Veganism should exclude "as far as possible and practicable – all forms of exploitation of, and cruelty to, animals for food, clothing or any other purpose; and by extension, promotes the development and use of animal-free alternatives for the benefit of humans and animals and the environment" (Calvert, 2014).

Calvert (2014) lists how it is for the sake of the animals that is the number one reason for people to go vegan. Environmental reasons are number two and thirdly comes health reasons. A vegan lifestyle includes a purely plant-based diet, and the rejecting of products made from or tested on animals as they do not condone animal experimentation in any form.

GNP is "the value of all products and services produced by the citizens of a country both domestically, and internationally minus income earned by foreign residents." (Investopedia, 2021). The GNP is currently calculated by taking the sum of personal consumption spendings, government spendings, private investment within one's own country, net exports (the difference between a country's export and import), and any earned income by residents from overseas investments. Næss (1989) himself advocates for value priorities as a new measurement system for GNP. This would work by measuring only the good things that are produced and a company's steps towards decreasing harmful activities and unhealthy working environments. For example, if a company with an unhealthy working environment (too many quit their job due to stress which in return puts a strain on the health system) should move to improve their internal systems so that less people got stressed, then this would give points toward a higher GNP. If companies produce bad things like, too many employers commute which causes traffic, pollution and accidents, or their production causes ecological damage in some way, these should be deducted from the GNP. GNP would, instead of being the market value of products, become the priority value of products and it would go from being an economic to an ecological statistic that is measuring a country's effort to reach the Deep Ecological ideal and not its own productivity. It's evident that our current economic structure (capitalism) is favouring and encouraging our wants, not our needs (food, water, territory) and humans share this need of food, water and territory with animals and plant life.

Coulter (2017) also advocates for economic and political solutions and alternatives to our current state by suggesting an interspecies solidarity, a solidarity which is built on empathy and compassion, but which also involves political commitment and support. "The principle of interspecies solidarity encourages us to take animals seriously as individuals, as social groups, and as members of multispecies communities and ecologies" (Coulter, 2017, p. 33). To do this in practice, Coulter (2017) suggests what she calls 'green care' and 'humane jobs'. The 'green care' are health care programs which encourages and uses positive interactions with nature like animal-assisted therapy. The 'humane jobs' are jobs which are both good for humans and animals and the term prioritizes a multispecies respect and dignity. Job examples could be: "Cruelty investigations, animal rescue and protection, companion animal care (e.g., dog walking, grooming), conservation" (Coulter, 2014, p. 35) and also but not limited to "wildlife guardians, park rangers, ecotourists guides" (Coulter, 2014, p. 36). Coulter (2014) further mentions how most jobs concerning care for or working with animals, today, are either unpaid or poorly paid, so by moving these jobs from the NGOs into the public sector both humans and animals would benefit. More funding would mean better financial situations for the human worker and ultimately more animals could be saved and cared for.

Danish office of WWF created the 'Wild Gardens in Denmark' project in 2021 where 1500 households applied to become chosen for a wild garden. WWF and a garden company would help the chosen households to plant and keep national wildlife plants to help further the biodiversity growth in Denmark. The many insects and small animals dependent on a rich biodiversity as well as the plants themselves will benefit from this

cooperation, giving Denmark richer nature and healthier biodiversity (WWF Denmark, 2021).

CONCLUSION

Around the world there are evidence of a growing sense of ecological citizenship, however, the evidence has only occurred nationally so far. It's a transnational citizenship and therefore needs transnational institutions and global plans to be fully implemented. Ecological citizenship recognizes the complex web of connections and interdependencies where our actions and choices impact people nationally and internationally. It's based on the virtues of justice, care and compassion and is non-territorial beyond space and time, as well as requires collective and individual actions. It's respectful, inclusive, and tolerant. A citizenship which stresses responsibility for the common good as well as an ethic of care for all humans, non-humans and nature and calls for a change in consciousness. However, ecological citizenship is limited as it only gives instrumental value to nature, so, a global understanding and recognition of intrinsic value as well as the rights of non-humans is needed before this concept of citizenship can be fully inclusive and ecological. Deep ecology is an eco-centric philosophy which consists of guiding principles (intrinsic value, right to flourish, ideological change in political, economic and technological structures, and an obligation of action) that offer a biocentric egalitarian world view through its philosophy of an 'equal right to live for all living things'. If the world ends soon then the idea of sustainability advocated by the ecological citizenship does not matter, but deep ecology is still morally valid and that is why the philosophy of deep ecology should be functioning as the moral understanding of the ecological citizenship. Furthermore, if deep ecology is used as a regulatory Ideal Theory to adjust and radically change our practices and our society then even if we never reach a complete deep ecological world then every little step towards it will have made the world better for everyone, human, animal, and plant life.

The use of deep ecology as an Ideal Theory means that we have a model so we can accept that it takes a long time to get where we want to go because we know where we need to go, making us keep doing better as people and as a global society. The Ideal Theory gives us this agreed and shared direction. The UN SDGs are built on a basis of strong principles such as: equality, dignity and a respect for nature as well as functioning as a framework of international accountability. Since the UN goals does show the connections and interdependencies between our actions and choices, are non-contractual responsibilities built on the values of justice, care and compassion and requires collective and individual action they have proven to be the transnational plan required for ecological citizenship to be fully implemented through. They are without a doubt a step in the right direction, but they are clearly not anywhere near the morals of deep ecology. An analysis of Goal 15 'Life on Land' show that there is only very superficial care and consideration given to animals and nature. Nowhere are any rights to life, rights of freedom, or any other right mentioned. The goal focuses on what is already illegal such as wildlife trade but forgets to focus on activities which cause great ecological degradation which are still legal. It's evident that although nature has been considered, insofar as to help sustain basic human life, nature on its own and for its own benefits hasn't been. Because of this, according to the morals of deep ecology, the UN Goals have failed from the very beginning, because they were built and created on a

wrong philosophical foundation and ideal. The point of the following examples is not to rule out current thinking and behaviour but to give examples of possible practices will help bring the global world toward the agreed future based on the shared belief in the deep ecology principles. Examples of these current global practices are, the way indigenous people live in harmony with nature based on their guiding principles of reciprocity, respect and responsibility to their environment and their 'I have obligations' mentality. The religion of Jainism which rejects violence in all forms. Its followers are strictly vegetarian, a cloth covering the mouth prevents insects from being swallowed and a feather sweeping the ground prevents a person from stepping on smaller life-forms. Veganism excludes all forms of animal exploitation and includes a purely plant-based diet, and the rejecting of products made from or tested on animals as they do not condone animal experimentation in any form. Næss himself advocated the idea of value priorities as a new measurement system for GNP. Only the good things that are produced and a company's steps towards decreasing harmful activities and unhealthy working environments would be part of the measurement. Interspecies solidarity is built on the ideas of empathy and compassion as well as encourages people to take animals seriously as individuals. It calls for a priority in respect and dignity toward all species. Jobs within this idea are called 'green care' (health care programs with positive interactions with nature) and 'humane jobs' (animal rescue and care, ecotourists guide, cruelty investigators, wildlife guardians and park ranger etc.). Wild gardens offering a space for biodiversity to grow and flourish without interference. In short, an ecological citizenship through a deep ecological perspective can incorporate the rights of non-human life into our daily lives by using a radically revised version of the UN 17 SDGs if those are founded on a philosophical change in consciousness different from what it was created on.

REFERENCES

Anker, P., and Witoszek, N., 1998. The dream of the Biocentric community and the structure of utopias. *Worldviews: Environment, Culture, Religion,* 2, 239-256.

Arneson, R., 2002. Egalitarianism. Edward N. Zalta (ed.). The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy [online]. Available from: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/egalitarianism Accessed on 12 December 2021.

Asah, S., 2015. Post-2015 Development Agenda: Human agency and the inoperability of the sustainable development architecture. *Human Development and Capabilities*, 16(4), pp. 631-636.

Asilsoy, B., Oktay, D., 2018. Exploring environmental behaviour as the major determinant of Ecological citizenship. *Sustainable cities and society*, 39, 765-771.

Blaustein, J., Pino, N., Fitz-Gibbon, K and White, R., 2018. Criminology and the UN sustainable development goals: the need for support and critique. Criminology, 58(4),767-786.

Bratton, S., 1999. Luc Ferry's critique of deep ecology, Nazi nature protection laws and environmental anti-semitism. *Ethics and Environment*, 4(1), 3-22.

Brennan, A., and Norva Y. S. L., 2002. Environmental Ethics. Edward N. Zalta (ed.). The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy [online]. Available from: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-environmental/ Accessed on 1 March 2020.

Britannica, the editors of Encyclopedia, 2019. Sherpa. Encyclopedia Britannica [online]. Available from https://www.britannica.com/topic/Sherpa-people Accessed on x20 October 2021.

Brunell, L., 2013. Building global citizenship: Engaging Global Issues, Practicing Civic Skills. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 9(1), 16-33.

Calvert, S., 2014. Ripened by human determination: 70 years of the Vegan Society [online]. Available from: https://www.vegansociety.com/sites/default/files/uploads/Ripened%20by%20human % 20determination.pdf Accessed on 26 October 2021.

Charman, K., 2008. Ecuador first to grant nature constitutional rights. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 19(4), 131-132.

Cherry, R., and Sandhu, H., 2013. Insects in the religions of India. *American Entomologist,* 59(4).

Coulter, K., 2017. Humane jobs: A political economic vision for interspecies solidarity and human-animal wellbeing. *Politics and Animals*, (3), 31-41.

Dedeoglu, C., Dedeoglu, C., 2020. Information infrastructures and the future of ecological citizenship in the Anthropocene. *Social Sciences*, 9(1).

DesJardins, Joseph R., 2015. Biocentrism. Encyclopaedia Britannica [online]. Available from: https://www.britannica.com/topic/biocentrism Accessed on 12 December 2021.

Dobson, A., 2003. *Citizenship and the Environment* [online]. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ehrlich, P., and Turnbull, C., 2014. Sustainable cities: The Australian Aboriginal Example. Stanford [online]. Available from: https://mahb.stanford.edu/blog/sustainable-societies/ Accessed on 25 August 2021.

European Commission, 2020. *Animal Welfare* [online]. Available from: https://ec.europa.eu/food/animals/welfare_en Accessed on 1 May 2020.

Goodwin, B., 2014. *Using Political Ideas*. 6.Edition. West Sussex: Wiley

Guha, R., 1989. Radical American environmentalism and wilderness preservation: A Third World critique. *Environmental Ethics*, 11(1), 71-83.

Harari, Y., 2011. *Sapiens*. London: Vintage

Heywood, A., 2013. *Political Ideas: An introduction.* 5. Edition. Basingstoke: Macmillan Palgrave.

Howles, T., Reader, J., Hodson, M., 2018. Creating an Ecological Citizenship: Philosophical and theological perspectives on the role of contemporary environmental education. *The Heythrop Journal*, 997-1008.

ICCA Consortium, 2021. Territories of life: 2021 Report [online]. Available from: https://report.territoriesoflife.org/ Accessed on 25 August 2021.

Madsen, P., 2016. Deep ecology. Encyclopedia Britannica [online]. Available from: https://www.britannica.com/topic/deep-ecology Accessed on 20 October 2021.

Mandle, J., and Roberts-Cady, S., 2021. John Rawls: an ideal theorist for nonideal times? Oxford University Press' Academic Insights for the Thinking World [online]. Available from: https://blog.oup.com/2021/02/john-rawls-an-ideal-theorist-for-nonideal-times/ Accessed on 20 October 2021.

Margil, M., 2018. The rights of nature gaining ground [online]. Available from: https://www.openglobalrights.org/the-rights-of-nature-gaining-ground/ Accessed on 21 April 2020.

Mcleod-Kilmurray, H., 2012. Commoditizing nonhuman animals and their consumers: industrial livestock production, animal welfare and ecological justice. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society,* 32(1), 71-85

Næss, A., 1973. The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement. A summary. *Inquiry 16*, 95-100.

Næss, A., 1989. Ecology, community and lifestyle: outline of an ecosophy [online].
    UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sessions, G., and Næss, A., 1984. *The Basic Principles of Deep Ecology* [online].
    Available from: http://thechurchofdeepecology.org/page-3.html Accessed on 25
    August 2021.

Spannring, R., 2019. Ecological citizenship education and the consumption of animal
    subjectivity. *Education Sciences*, 9(41), 1-11.

Strohl, G., Shah, U., and Dundas, P., 2021. Jainism. Encyclopedia Britannica [online].
Available from: https://www.britannica.com/topic/Jainism Accessed on 26 October
    2021.

The Investopedia Team, 2021. Gross National Product (GNP) [online]. Available from:
    https://www.investopedia.com/terms/g/gnp.asp Accessed on 12 December
    2021.

UN, 2020. Sustainable Development Goals – Knowledge Platform [online]. Available
    from: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/?menu=1300 Accessed on 4 May
    2020.

UNESCO, 2018. UNESCO's Commitment to Biodiversity: Connecting people and
    nature for an inspiring future [online]. Paris: UNESCO.

Wenar, L., 2008. John Rawls; 2.3 Ideal and Non-Ideal Theory; 4 Justice as Fairness:
    Justice within a liberal society; 5.6 Reconciliation and Realistic Utopia. Edward N.

Zalta (ed.). The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy [online]. Available from:
    https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rawls/ Accessed on 26 October 2021.

Wohlleben, P., 2017. *The Hidden Life of Trees.* London: Williams Collins.
    WWF Denmark, 2021. Project Danmarks Vilde Haver [online]. Available from:
    https://www.wwf.dk/om-os/hvor-kaemper-vi/projekt-danmarks-vilde-haver/
    Accessed on 16 December 2021.